

Improved bilinears in unquenched lattice QCD *

Tanmoy Bhattacharya^a, Rajan Gupta^a, Weonjong Lee^b, Stephen R. Sharpe^c and Jackson M. S. Wu^c^aTheoretical Division, Los Alamos National Lab, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA^bSchool of Physics, Seoul National University, Seoul, 151-747, Korea^cPhysics Department, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-1560, USA

We summarize the extent to which one can use Ward identities (WI) to non-perturbatively improve flavor singlet and non-singlet bilinears with three flavors of non-degenerate dynamical Wilson-like fermions.

It is important to pursue simulations with Wilson-like fermions, despite their greater computational cost than staggered fermions, because one avoids the theoretical uncertainty associated with taking roots of the fermion determinant. One drawback with Wilson fermions is that they lead to discretization errors of $O(a)$, slowing the approach to the continuum. This can be ameliorated using an $O(a)$ improved action, with the relevant improvement coefficient, c_{SW} , determined non-perturbatively using the method of Ref. [1]. One also wants to improve the matrix elements of operators, and a technique for doing so has been worked out for non-singlet quark bilinears with degenerate dynamical quarks [1].

Here we sketch the generalization of this improvement program to the realistic case of three non-degenerate dynamical quarks, and to all bilinears, including flavor singlets. The inclusion of flavor singlets is a necessary part of the technique, and is furthermore of phenomenological interest.

This study is the completion of the work presented in [2], which was incomplete and partly incorrect. Many details must necessarily be skipped in this short writeup; a complete discussion, including the generalization to two and four flavors, will be presented in [3].

We assume that the following steps in the improvement program have already been taken: (1) c_{SW} and c_A have been determined by enforcing the PCAC relation for non-singlet axial currents with degenerate quarks [1]; (2) κ_c is known from

the vanishing of the “Ward identity mass”, so that the bare quark masses $am_j = 1/2\kappa_j - 1/2\kappa_c$ can be defined; (3) Non-singlet vector and tensor bilinears have been improved by the addition of the standard c_V and c_T terms [1], which are then determined by enforcing axial WI in the chiral limit [4,5,6]—so that all improved non-singlet bilinears $O^{(jk),I}$ are known in the chiral limit;² and (4) b_g has been determined, using the methods of Refs. [1,6] or that presented below, and the bare coupling g_0 is adjusted, as the mass matrix $M = \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3)$ is varied, so that the effective coupling $g_0^2(1 + a b_g \text{tr} M / N_f)$ is held fixed.

As already noted in [2], the generalization to non-degenerate quarks introduces many new improvement coefficients. The improved, renormalized off-diagonal bilinears ($O = S, P, V, A, T$),

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{(jk)} = Z_O [1 + a \bar{b}_O \text{tr} M + a b_O \frac{1}{2} (m_j + m_k)] \mathcal{O}^{(jk),I},$$

require one more coefficient, $\bar{b}_O$, than in the quenched case, while the diagonal non-singlet bilinears require another new coefficient, f_O :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{O}}^{(jj)} - \hat{\mathcal{O}}^{(kk)} = Z_O \Big[(1 + a \bar{b}_O \text{tr} M) (\mathcal{O}^{(jj),I} - \mathcal{O}^{(kk),I}) \\ + a b_O (m_j \mathcal{O}^{(jj)} - m_k \mathcal{O}^{(kk)}) + a f_O (m_j - m_k) \text{tr} \mathcal{O} \Big]. \end{aligned}$$

For $O = S$ there is also mixing with the identity operator, missed in [2], and discussed below.

Flavor singlet bilinears require new coefficients. In the chiral limit one has

$$(\text{tr} A_\mu)^I = \text{tr} A_\mu + a \bar{c}_A \partial_\mu \text{tr} P$$

*Research supported in part by US-DOE grant KA-04-01010-E161 and contract DE-FG03-96ER40956/A006, and by BK21, the SNU foundation & Overhead Research fund and KRF contract KRF-2002-003-C00033.

²Notation: O is a 3×3 flavor matrix, flavor labels i, j, k are not summed, and are implicitly taken to be distinct.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{tr}V_\mu)^I &= \text{tr}V_\mu + a\bar{c}_V\partial_\nu\text{tr}T_{\mu\nu} \\
(\text{tr}T_{\mu\nu})^I &= \text{tr}T_{\mu\nu} + a\bar{c}_T[\partial_\mu\text{tr}V_\nu - \partial_\nu\text{tr}V_\mu] \\
(\text{tr}P)^I &= \text{tr}P + a g_P\text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}) \\
(\text{tr}S)^I &= a^{-3}e_S + \text{tr}S + a g_S\text{Tr}(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that gluonic operators are needed to improve $\text{tr}P$ and $\text{tr}S$ (but not $\text{tr}T$, as erroneously concluded in [2]), and the need to subtract the identity operator from $\text{tr}S$. Away from the chiral limit one has

$$\widehat{\text{tr}}\mathcal{O} = Z_O r_O [(1 + a\bar{d}_O\text{tr}M)\text{tr}(\mathcal{O})^I + a d_O\text{tr}(M\mathcal{O})],$$

with new coefficients r_O , d_O and $\bar{d}_O$. r_A is scale dependent since the singlet axial current has anomalous dimension, while the other r_O are scale independent. For $O = S$ we have implicitly subtracted mass dependent mixing with the identity operator, as discussed below.

Finally, the improved quark masses are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\text{tr}}\lambda\bar{M} &= Z_m [(1 + a\bar{b}_m\text{tr}M)\text{tr}\lambda\bar{M} + a b_m\text{tr}(\lambda M^2)] \\
\widehat{\text{tr}}\bar{M} &= Z_m r_m [(1 + a\bar{d}_m\text{tr}M)\text{tr}M + a d_m\text{tr}(M^2)]
\end{aligned}$$

where λ are Gell-Mann matrices. Z_m is scale dependent, while r_m is not. Note that there is no independent f_m -like term.

The coefficient e_S would need to be determined to an accuracy of a^4 to improve $\text{tr}S$, which appears impractical. However, to calculate hadronic matrix elements *one must subtract disconnected contributions anyway*, and this completely cancels the e_S term. Similarly, the e_S contribution can be canceled when implementing WI by subtracting disconnected contributions. In this way one can avoid the problem, except when calculating the vacuum expectation value. The same issue arises for the diagonal non-singlet scalars away from the chiral limit, and has the same resolution.

The first step in determining the improvement coefficients is standard: one enforces the normalization of vector charges for a selection of hadrons for various quark masses. This determines Z_V , r_V , b_V , $\bar{b}_V$, f_V , d_V and $\bar{d}_V$, i.e. all the vector coefficients except c_V and $\bar{c}_V$. The latter do not contribute to the charges.

In Ref. [2] it was claimed that one can learn about other improvement coefficients by enforcing the vector transformation properties of bilinears. This is incorrect. The essential reason is

that the lattice theory does not break the vector symmetry. The relations that were to be used can be shown to be automatically satisfied.

The next step is to relate the coefficients for scalar bilinears and the quark mass, enforcing the standard continuum convention $Z_S Z_m = 1$. This is unchanged from Ref. [2]—the new e_S term does not contribute. The result is that all other coefficients for the scalar can be expressed in terms of those for the quark mass, so that the former are redundant. In particular, we find $g_S = b_g/(2g_0^2)$, and the constraint $d_S = b_S + 3\bar{b}_S$, which follows from the absence of an f_m term.

We next consider “two-point” axial WI, i.e. enforce the axial divergence relations on improved quantities while varying quark masses. In addition to the off-diagonal currents used in [1,7] and [2], we now use flavor diagonal currents:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \partial_\mu (\hat{A}_\mu^{(jj)}(x) - \hat{A}_\mu^{(kk)}(x)) J(0) \rangle &= O(a^2) + \\
2 \left\langle \left[\hat{m}_j \hat{P}^{(jj)}(x) - \hat{m}_k \hat{P}^{(kk)}(x) \right] J(0) \right\rangle & \quad [x \neq 0].
\end{aligned}$$

The RHS involves singlet parts of M and P , illustrating how these cannot be avoided. When expanded out in terms of bare lattice operators and masses, there are several independent operators on both sides, as well as quark-connected and disconnected contractions, so this relation will be complicated to implement. Nevertheless, it is a powerful constraint, yielding eight independent combinations of coefficients [3].

The final step is to enforce the axial transformation properties of the bilinears—the so-called “three-point” axial WI. Relations of the form

$$\delta_A^{(ij)} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}^{(jk)} = \widehat{\delta\mathcal{O}}^{(ik)}$$

are the simplest to implement as they involve no quark-disconnected contractions. They have been used extensively in quenched simulations [1,5], and can be used in the chiral limit to determine c_V and c_T as noted above. The generalization to the unquenched case is straightforward.

To determine many of the new coefficients, however, one must use other three-point WI. Consider first the transformation properties of the singlet axial current:

$$O(a^2) = \langle \delta_A^{(ij)} \mathcal{S} \text{tr}[\widehat{A}_\mu(y)] J^{(ji)}(z) \rangle$$

$$\delta_A^{(ij)} \mathcal{S} = a^4 \sum_{\mathcal{V}} \left[(\hat{m}_i + \hat{m}_j) \hat{P}^{(ij)} - \partial_\mu \hat{A}_\mu^{(ij)} \right].$$

Here the four-volume $\mathcal{V}$ contains y but not z . Contact terms are avoided by setting $\hat{m}_i + \hat{m}_j = 0$. The above relation allows the determination of the *relative size* of different terms in $\text{tr} \hat{A}$, though not the overall normalization. We find that one can obtain $\bar{c}_A$ and d_A . Replacing $\text{tr} A$ with $\text{tr} V$ one can similarly obtain $\bar{c}_V$ and d_V .

Further coefficients result from enforcing

$$\delta_A^{(ij)} \text{tr}[\widehat{T}_{\mu\nu}] = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \widehat{T}_{\rho\sigma}^{(ij)}.$$

This determines the relative size of different terms in $\text{tr} \hat{T}$ (giving $\bar{c}_T$ and d_T) and the ratio of normalizations of LHS and RHS (giving r_T and $\bar{b}_T - \bar{d}_T$).

The scalar case is of particular interest, i.e.

$$\langle \delta_A^{(ij)} \mathcal{S} \text{tr}[\widehat{S}(y)] J^{(ji)}(z) \rangle = 2 \langle \widehat{P}^{(ij)}(y) J^{(ji)}(z) \rangle$$

From this it appears that one can determine g_S and d_S from the relative normalizations on the LHS, and r_S and $\bar{b}_P - \bar{d}_S$ from the ratios of normalizations of the LHS and RHS. There is, however, a subtlety because of the identity operator contribution to $\text{tr} S$. Formally, this contribution vanishes since it is invariant under axial transformations, and in particular

$$\langle \delta_A^{(ij)} \mathcal{S} J^{(ji)}(z) \rangle = O(a^2).$$

However, the divergent coefficient $\propto 1/a^3$ invalidates this argument for the lattice calculation, so that one must explicitly subtract the disconnected contribution

$$\langle \text{tr}[\widehat{S}(y)] \rangle \times \langle \delta_A^{(ij)} \mathcal{S} J^{(ji)}(z) \rangle$$

from the LHS to remove the e_S term.

This provides a new method for determining $b_g = 2g_0^2 g_S$. Note that one can carry out this determination in the chiral limit, so that one does not need to know b_g *a priori*.

The final WI giving new information is³

$$\delta_A^{(jk)} \widehat{T}_{\mu\nu}^{(kj)}(y) = -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \left[\widehat{T}_{\rho\sigma}^{(jj)}(y) + \widehat{T}_{\rho\sigma}^{(kk)}(y) \right]$$

The RHS contains singlet and non-singlet pieces, and so gives new information on improvement coefficients, although at the cost of requiring quark-disconnected contractions. We find that, in addition to constants determined previously, this WI

³This was not considered in [2].

allows the determination of f_T . A new subtlety here is that the contact terms to be avoided cannot be obtained simply using the prescription for equation-of-motion operators given in [5].

Combining results from all the WI considered above, we find that one can determine all the renormalization and improvement coefficients introduced above except (1) the scale-dependent constants Z_T , $Z_S Z_P$, and r_A (whose determination requires use of a method like NPR, which fixes operator normalizations by some convention); and (2) the two scale independent quantities $\bar{d}_A$ and $\bar{b}_T + \bar{d}_T$.⁴

Several issues merit further investigation. For example, is it possible to determine $\bar{d}_A$ and $\bar{b}_T + \bar{d}_T$ using other Ward identities? How do the results generalize to two and four flavors (see Ref. [3])? What is lost if one works at fixed g_0^2 , which is easier in practice? And to what extent does the proposal of Ref. [8] (which requires an even number of flavors in its simplest form) remove the need to determine the improvement coefficients?

REFERENCES

1. K.Jansen *et al.*, Phys.Lett.B **372**, 275(1996) [arXiv:hep-lat/9512009]; M.Lüscher *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **478**, 365 (1996) [arXiv:hep-lat/9605038].
2. T.Bhattacharya *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **83-84**,902(2000) [arXiv:hep-lat/9909092].
3. T.Bhattacharya *et al.*, in preparation.
4. M.Guagnelli & R.Sommer, Nucl.Phys.B(Proc. Suppl.)**63**,886(1998) [arXiv:hep-lat/9709088]
5. T.Bhattacharya *et al.*, Phys.Lett.B**461**,79 (1999) [arXiv:hep-lat/9904011]; Phys.Rev.D **63**, 074505(2001) [arXiv:hep-lat/0009038].
6. G.Martinelli *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **411**, 141(1997) [arXiv:hep-lat/9705018].
7. G.M.deDivitiis and R.Petronzio, Phys.Lett.B **419**, 311(1998) [arXiv:hep-lat/9710071].
8. R.Frezzotti and G.C.Rossi, arXiv:hep-lat/0306014.

⁴This corrects the conclusion of [2] that there were three undetermined scale independent quantities.